LIBRARY
20 APR 1956
THE LEGISLATURE, MADRAS

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 27th January 1956.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : On a point of order, Sir. A question given notice of by me and to be answered on the 25th was agreed to be postponed to the 27th, that is, to-day. I wrote to you, Sir, about this and you also gave your consent to its postponement and said that arrangements had been made to answer it to-day. But I do not find it now.

MR. SPEAKER : Will the hon. Member state the number of the question?

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Question No. 2964.

MR. SPEAKER : That is a question which was put by the hon. Member and answered by the Hon. the Minister in his presence on the 25th. I think he even put a supplementary question on it. Ordinarily, when the Member is present and the question is put, the previous request for postponement must be deemed to have been waived because he participates in it.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : My supplementary was on question No. 2963 put by Mr. Palaniswami, and not on my question.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member did not take any objection on that day and I had this fact particularly in mind and thought that the hon. Member had waived his previous request, especially because he was physically present here.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I was physically present but I did not give my consent to its being answered on that day. I even rose in my seat . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Does the hon. Member want any supplementaries to be put on his question? If that is so, I shall give notice to the Hon. the Minister and take it up tomorrow, if he wants.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Is it in order, Sir, to allow a question that has been answered and completed to be reopened on another day and if so, under what rule?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The point is this. The question was called and if the hon. Member wanted that it should be taken up on another day, he shoud have made a representation

to that effect then. As a matter of fact, I answered it on the 25th If the hon. Member wants any more information, he can put a short-notice question arising out of the question already answered. I shall waive notice and answer it tomorrow or the day after that.

Mr. SPEAKER : I think that will serve the purpose of the hon. Member.

Theft of timber from Koothali Estate

* 2998 Q.—Sri P. KUNHIRAMA KIDAV : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report from the Estate Officer of Koothali Estate in Kurumbranad taluk regarding the theft of timber from Koothali estate ;

(b) if so, the action taken to book the culprits and also to prevent theft in future?

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes.

(b) Action was taken to prosecute the offenders in most cases. The offenders were convicted in four cases and acquitted in three cases. Nineteen cases were compounded, and the cuttings seized were sold in auction. Prosecution is pending in five cases. To prevent illicit cuttings, the provisions of section 26 of the Madras Forest Act, 1882, were extended to the Pillaperuvanna Malavaram and the management of the forest has since been taken over by the Forest Department.

Sri M. NARAYANA KURUP : In 1945, timber worth Rs. 20,000 was entrusted to the care of a forest official on personal surety? May I know whether any process was taken with respect to that for the recovery of the amount?

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : That was ten years ago and I would request the hon. Member to put a separate question.

9-10 a.m. Sri P. KUNHIRAMA KIDAV : May I know from the Hon. Minister when the enquiry was conducted, who was authorized to conduct the enquiry and what was the result of the enquiry?

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : The Collector was asked to enquire into it and it was found there was illicit felling and steps were taken to prevent illicit cutting. In order to ensure that in future there may not be large scale illicit cutting like this, the provisions of the Madras Forest Act have been extended to this area also.

Sri M. NARAYANA KURUP : The Hon. Minister mentioned a number of offences committed. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a very recent judgment of the Tellicherry Assistant Sessions Judge where he has passed very severe strictures on the Forest Officials beginning from the Conservator of